



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/468,083      | 12/21/1999  | AMIT KESARWANI       | BS99-059            | 3192             |

28970 7590 03/04/2004

SHAW PITTMAN  
IP GROUP  
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD  
SUITE 1300  
MCLEAN, VA 22102

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

NALVEN, ANDREW L

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2134

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

dm

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/468,083

**Applicant(s)**

KESARWANI ET AL.

**Examiner**

Andrew L Nalven

**Art Unit**

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/03/03.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-13 and 15-30 are pending.
2. The amendment received 12/03/03 has been entered and considered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 and 15-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 15-18 are objected to because of the following informalities: The designated claims are dependent from claim 14. Applicant canceled claim 14 in amendment of 12/03/03. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2134

6. Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-17, 19-20 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Keyser et al US Patent No. 5,025,373 in view of Williams US Patent No. 5,692,157. Keyser discloses a portable personal-banking system based upon a remote terminal communicating with a central server.

7. With regards to claims 1, 6, 10, 19, Keyser discloses a main office (bank host server) that is in communication with a remote terminal (column 3, lines 58-60). The main office retains data rules that dictate the type of data required for entry (column 4, lines 35-44) and access rules that dictate what information is needed in order to access the main host services (column 6, lines 12-22). The remote terminal receives the data rules and access rules from the main host (column 4, lines 35-44 and column 4, lines 59-64). The remote terminal transmits data to the host in conformity with the data rules (column 4, lines 62-64) and access rules (column 13, lines 42-58). Keyser fails to teach the access rule comprising a formatting standard rule and the formatting standard rule being sent to the remote office before data transmission. Williams teaches at least one access rule comprising a formatting standard rule used by the main office (Williams, column 13 lines 27-31 and column 14 lines 15-16) and the formatting standard rule being sent to the remote office (server) before the remote office sends entered data to the main office (client) such that the data is first correctly formatted to be compatible with the format used by the main office (Williams, column 14 lines 16-20). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include Williams' method of sending formatting standard rules before data transfer because it offers the advantage of registering data formats that the main office

Art Unit: 2134

application can receive and send data in thus providing a mechanism for transferring data between remote offices and main offices in a designated format (Williams, column 2 lines 38-61).

1. With regards to claims 2 and 15, Keyser as modified discloses a security access code in the form of a unique terminal or personal computer identification (column 6, lines 12-14).
2. With regards to claims 3 and 16, Keyser as modified discloses a password in the form of a PIN (personal identification number) (column 6, lines 20-22).
3. With regards to claims 4 and 17, Keyser as modified discloses the verification of login information before any services are provided (column 6, lines 21-22).
4. With regards to claims 7 and 11, Keyser as modified discloses data rules including field format such as a numeral (column 4, lines 41), a date (column 7, lines 58-60), or a currency (column 7, lines 52-56).
5. With regards to claims 8 and 12, Keyser as modified discloses data rules that specify the number of fields to communicate with the main host such as sending a single field in response to a request to choose a menu option (column 14, lines 27-35).
6. With regards to claims 9 and 13, Keyser as modified discloses data rules that specify the organization of a field such as currency fields or date fields (column 11, lines 14-20).
7. With regards to claim 20, Keyser as modified discloses a portable banking system comprising a host computer and at least one terminal (Abstract lines 1-3).

Art Unit: 2134

8. With regards to claim 23, Keyser as modified discloses that a change in data rules at the main host causes a change in data rules at the terminal by changing how options are exercised (column 5, lines 15-22). Upon each connection, new menu items are sent to the terminals that define the data rules for the session (column 13 line 65 – column 14 line 34).

9. With regards to claim 24, Keyser as modified discloses access rules such as PIN numbers that are requested when the main host instructs the remote display to ask for the PIN (column 13, lines 51-53). Keyser lacks a reference to the main host changing these access rules and thus causing a similar change in the remote terminal. The examiner takes official notice that maintenance of software is desirable. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow a change in the main host access rules to cause a similar change in the remote terminal because it would allow modifications to be made to the system by applying changes to the main host while requiring no maintenance to the remote terminals (Keyser – Abstract).

10. Claims 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Lipner et al US Patent No. 5,553,304 in view of Williams US Patent No. 5,692,157. Lipner teaches a method for generating and executing complex operating procedures. Lipner discloses a database system (column 2, lines 25-28) that includes a plurality of fields (Figure 2B) that includes data elements termed descriptors that represent physical features of a power plant (column 7, lines 32-37) and functions that relate the data

Art Unit: 2134

elements (descriptors) to specific values (column 7, lines 49-51). Lipner proposes a test function, E0, which includes the first operator (substep a) and a second operator (substep b) (column 4, lines 52-60). Lipner fails to teach a main office retaining access rules and data rules and being in communication with at least one remote office, the access rule comprising a formatting standard rule, and the formatting standard rule being sent to the remote office before data transmission. Williams teaches a main office retaining access rules and data rules and being in communication with a remote office (Williams, column 13 lines 27-31, Figure 3), at least one access rule comprising a formatting standard rule used by the main office (Williams, column 13 lines 27-31 and column 14 lines 15-16), and the formatting standard rule being sent to the remote office (server) before the remote office sends entered data to the main office (client) such that the data is first correctly formatted to be compatible with the format used by the main office (Williams, column 14 lines 16-20). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include Williams' method of sending formatting standard rules before data transfer because it offers the advantage of registering data formats that the main office application can send and receive data in; thus providing a mechanism for transferring data between remote offices and main offices in a designated format (Williams, column 2 lines 38-61).

11. With regards to claim 28, Lipner as modified discloses the first operator (substep a) and a second operator (substep b) being formed from the contents of other tables (column 4, lines 53-55 and Figure 2B). Lipner further discloses data elements stored in a descriptor table of the database (Figure 2B).

Art Unit: 2134

12. With regards to claims 29 and 30, Lipner as modified discloses a steps table that stores operators and data elements in a predetermined order (column 4, lines 52-55 and Figure 2B). The steps are formed into equations in the predetermined order such as substeps a to b to c to produce the desired function (column 4, lines 52-55).

13. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keyser et al US Patent No. 5,025,373 and Williams US Patent No 5,692,157, as applied to claim 19 above, and in further view of Hamala et al US Patent No. 5,345,586. Keyser and Williams describe a system as disclosed above. Keyser as modified lacks a reference to remote terminals communicating with the main host over the internet or an intranet. Hamala describes a system of manipulating heterogeneous distributed data a data processing system. Hamala discloses that data manipulation may work on data distributed across a network or a plurality of networks (column 3, lines 24-26) including gateways (Figure 1). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Hamala's range of communication because it would provide greater range of access opportunities to the host computer.

14. Claims 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keyser et al US Patent No. 5,025,373 and Williams US Patent No 5,692,157, as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and in further view of Schaefer US Patent No. 5,826,268. Keyser and Williams describe a system as disclosed above. Keyser as modified fails to teach access rules that limit the amount of information the remote office has access to.



Art Unit: 2134

Schaefer discloses a secure multilevel object oriented database management system.

Schaefer discloses an access validation monitor that enforces access rules (column 1 line 64 – column 2 line 4) of communication that limits the amount of data in the form of objects accessible (column 3, lines 65-67) to a remote user such as a client site (column 3, line 64). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide access rules that limit the amount of accessible data because it would allow a distinction to be made between authorized and unauthorized data for a specific client (column 1 line 66 – column 2 line 4) and thus provide varying levels of access.

15. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keyser et al US Patent No. 5,025,373 and Williams US Patent No 5,692,157, as applied to claim 19 above, and in further view of Spencer et al US Patent No.

6,356,909. Keyser and Williams describe a system as disclosed above. Keyser as modified fails to teach the remote terminal communicating with the main office through a web site, the remote terminal providing information to a web site, and the remote terminal retrieving information from the website. Spencer describes a web based method of requests and responses. Spencer discloses that remote clients communicate with a server through web sites (column 6, lines 31-35). Remote clients provide information to the web site such as search criteria for querying a database (column 6, lines 35-40). The main server for a database maintains a website that acts as a user interface for the database (column 6, lines 37-38) and the remote clients

Art Unit: 2134

access information from the website (column 6, lines 32-35). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide a system whereby a website would act as the communication portal for main office and remote office communications because the use of a web site provides a well known common interface that is secure and easy to use (column 3, lines 58-61).

### ***Conclusion***

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2134

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew L Nalven whose telephone number is 703 305 8407. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 703 308 4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

\*\*\*

Andrew Nalven

ALN

*Matthew D. Smithers*  
**MATTHEW SMITHERS**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*Art Unit 2137*